

August 25, 2003

Mr. James M. Frazier III Assistant General Counsel Texas Department of Criminal Justice P.O. Box 4004 Huntsville, Texas 77342

OR2003-5946

Dear Mr. Frazier:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 186630.

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (the "department") received a request for any records related to a specified case number. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you state that most of the requested information is the same information that was previously requested and ruled upon by this office in Open Records Letter No. 2003-4549 (2003). From our review of the submitted information, we agree that the current request encompasses most of the information that was at issue in your previous request for a decision. However, the investigation at issue was completed following the department's receipt of the initial request for this information and prior to its receipt of the instant request. Consequently, because the circumstances on which our prior ruling was based have changed, we find that the four criteria for a "previous determination" established by this office in Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) have not been met. Therefore, the department may not

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The four criteria for this type of "previous determination" are 1) the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D) of the Government Code; 2) the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; 3) the attorney general's prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"); and 4) the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior attorney general ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling. See Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).

rely on Open Records Ruling No. 2003-4549 as a previous determination. Therefore, we will address your claimed exceptions.

We note that the submitted information is made expressly public under section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part:

- (a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:
  - (1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

The submitted information consists of a completed investigation which is expressly public under section 552.022(a). You do not claim that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.108. Therefore, you may withhold this information only if it is confidential under other law. Although you argue that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception and therefore is not "other law" for the purposes of section 552.022. See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 551 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 serves only to protect governmental body's position in litigation and does not itself make information confidential); see also Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n. 5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, you may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103. However, we will address your arguments under sections 552.101 and 552.117 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. For information to be protected by common-law privacy it must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The *Industrial Foundation* court stated that information is excepted from disclosure if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. 540 S.W.2d at 685.

In Morales v. Ellen, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.--El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in Ellen contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to

the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. Ellen, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. Id. In concluding, the Ellen court held that "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." Id.

The submitted investigation contains information that we find to be analogous to the summary released in *Ellen*. In accordance with the holding in *Ellen*, the department must release the summary, which we have marked. However, before releasing this document, the department must redact the information that we have indicated tends to identify the complainant and witnesses.<sup>2</sup> All other submitted information, including individual complainant and witness statements as well as other supporting documentary evidence, must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in accordance with the commonlaw privacy concerns expressed in *Ellen*. As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining arguments.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>We note that some of the submitted information may be confidential and not subject to release to the general public. See Gov't Code § 552.023. However, the requestor in this instance has a special right of access to the information. Gov't Code § 552.023. Because some of the information may be confidential with respect to the general public, if the department receives a further request for this information from an individual other than this requestor or his authorized representative, the department should again seek our decision.

records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

V. Mutzerny Mith

W. Montgomery Meitler Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

WMM/lmt

Ref: ID# 186630

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Ted Geisinger 16015 Timberway St. San Antonio, Texas 78247 (w/o enclosures)